arXiv:1408.0927v1 [quant-ph] 5 Aug 2014

An unsuitable use of spin and pseudospin symmetries with a pseudoscalar Cornell potential

L. B. Castro[1]
Departamento de Física, CFM
Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina,
88040-900, CP. 476, Florianópolis - SC, Brazil

and

A. S. de Castro[2]
Departamento de Física e Química, Campus de Guaratinguetá
Universidade Estadual Paulista,
12516-410, Guaratinguetá - SP, Brazil

[1]luis.castro@pgfsc.ufsc.br
[2]castro@pesquisador.cnpq.br

Abstract

It is shown that a recent publication (2013 *Chin. Phys. B* **22** 090301) uses the concepts of spin and pseudospin symmetries as mere rhetoric to decorate the pseudoscalar potential. It is also pointed out that a more complete analysis of the bound states of fermions in a pseudoscalar Cornell potential had already been published elsewhere.

Key-words: Dirac equation, pseudoscalar potential, Cornell potential, spin symmetry, pseudospin symmetry

PACS: 03.65.-w, 03.65.Fd, 02.30.Gp

Back in 2004 de Castro [1] found the analytic solutions of the Dirac equation for a pseudoscalar linear plus Coulomb-like potential

$$mc\omega x + \frac{\hbar c g}{x} \tag{1}$$

where ω and g are real parameters. The author of Ref. [1] approached the problem under a Sturm-Liouville perspective for a large range of parameters but the possibility of isolated solutions from the Sturm-Liouville perspective was neglected [2]. In a recent article published in Chinese Physics B, Hamzavi and Rajabi [3] alleged to have found the exact solutions of the Dirac equation with a pseudoscalar Cornell potential

$$-\frac{a}{x} + bx \tag{2}$$

under the spin and pseudospin symmetry limits. The purpose of this work is to clarify that Hamzavi and Rajabi failed to perceive the possibility of isolated solutions, as did de Castro in Ref. [1]. More than this, Hamzavi and Rajabi incurred in a clear lack of understanding about spin and pseudospin symmetries and truly presented the solutions for a pure pseudoscalar coupling for a more restrict range of parameters than in Ref. [1].

Spin and pseudospin symmetries are SU(2) symmetries of a Dirac equation with vector and scalar potentials realized when the difference between the potentials, or their sum, is a constant [4]. The upper (lower) component of the Dirac spinor satisfies a Schrödinger-like equation in the case of spin (pseudospin) symmetry and the resulting spectrum is independent of the orientation of the spin (see, e.g. [5]). Furthermore, the spin-orbit and the Darwin terms disappear from the second-order equations for the upper and lower components of the Dirac spinor under the spin and pseudospin conditions in such a way that spin-1/2 and spin-0 particles have equivalent spectra [6]. If the difference between the vector and scalar potentials, or their sum, is not a constant there is no spin, or pseudospin, symmetry. Spin and pseudospin symmetries are also broken if the potential is contaminated by other sorts of couplings (pseudoscalar or tensor couplings, for example) [7]. In fact, there has been a continuous interest for solving the Dirac equations in the four-dimensional space-time as well as in lower dimensions by assuming that the vector potential has the same magnitude as the scalar potential [1]-[54]. In 1+1 dimensions it is usual to say that the system has spin or pseudospin symmetries if the potentials are limited to vector and scalar Lorentz structures with the same magnitude because, despite the absence of spin effects, many attributes of the real spin or pseudospin symmetries in 3+1 dimensions are preserved. In the presence of time-independent interactions the most general 1+1 dimensional time-independent Dirac equation for a fermion of rest mass m and momentum p reads

$$\left(\sigma_1\hat{p} + \sigma_3 m + \frac{I+\sigma_3}{2}V_\Sigma + \frac{I-\sigma_3}{2}V_\Delta + \sigma_2 V_p\right)\psi = E\psi \tag{3}$$

where E is the energy of the fermion, $V_\Sigma = V_v + V_s$ and $V_\Delta = V_v - V_s$. The subscripts for the terms of potential denote their properties under a Lorentz transformation: v for the time component of the two-vector potential, s for the scalar potential and p for the pseudoscalar potential. σ_i are the Pauli matrices and I is the 2×2 unit matrix. Hamzavi and Rajabi [3] in the subsection *Spin symmetry limit* (subsection

3.1) considered an equation for the upper component of the Dirac spinor with $\Sigma = 0$, $\Delta = C_s = 0$, $E \neq -m$, and in the subsection *Pseudospin symmetry limit* (subsection 3.2) considered an equation for the lower component of the Dirac spinor with $\Delta = 0$, $\Sigma = C_{ps} = 0$, $E \neq +m$. Therefore, in both circumstances they took into account $V_v = V_s = 0$. Indeed, in simple words, they in fact considered a pure pseudoscalar potential in such a way that for $E \neq \mp m$

$$\psi_{\mp} = -\frac{i}{E \pm m}\left(\frac{d\psi_{\pm}}{dx} \mp V_p \psi_{\pm}\right) \tag{4}$$

and

$$-\frac{d^2\psi_{\pm}}{dx^2} + \left(V_p^2 \pm \frac{dV_p}{dx}\right)\psi_{\pm} = \left(E^2 - m^2\right)\psi_{\pm} \tag{5}$$

On the other hand, for $E = \mp m$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{\pm} &= N_{\pm} e^{\pm v(x)} \\ \psi_{\mp} &= \left[N_{\mp} - i N_{\pm} I_{\pm}(x)\right] e^{\mp v(x)} \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where N_+ and N_- are normalization constants, and

$$\begin{aligned} v(x) &= \int^x dy\, V_p(y) \\ I_{\pm}(x) &= \pm 2m \int^x dy\, e^{\pm 2v(y)} \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

In summary manner, the solutions of the Sturm-Liouville problem with a pseudoscalar linear plus Coulomb-like potential (or Cornell potential if one likes) had already been extensively discussed in Ref. [1], and the isolated solutions in Ref. [2]. What is more, the rhetoric is great but there is no spin or pseudospin symmetries in the system approached in Ref. [3] because of the complete absence of vector and scalar couplings.

References

[1] de Castro A S 2004 *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **311** 170

[2] Castro L B and de Castro A S 2013 *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **338** 278

[3] Hamzavi M and Rajabi A A 2013 *Chin. Phys. B* **22** 090301

[4] Bell J S and Ruegg H 1975 *Nucl. Phys. B* **98** 151

[5] Ginocchio J N 2005 *Phys. Rep.* **414** 165

[6] Alberto P, de Castro A S and Malheiro M 2007 *Phys. Rev. C* **75** 047303

[7] Lisboa R, Malheiro M, de Castro A S, Alberto P and Fiolhais M 2004 *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **13** 1447

[8] Alberto P, Lisboa R, Malheiro M and de Castro A S 2005 *Phys. Rev. C* **71** 034313

[9] Gumbs G and Kiang D 1986 *Am. J. Phys.* **54** 462

[10] Domínguez-Adame F 1990 *Am. J. Phys.* **58** 886

[11] de Castro A S 2002 *Phys. Lett. A* **305** 100

[12] Nogami Y, Toyama F M and van Dijk W 2003 *Am. J. Phys.* **71** 950

[13] Gou Y and Sheng Z Q 2005 *Phys. Lett. A* **338** 90

[14] de Castro A S, Alberto P, Lisboa R and Malheiro M 2006 *Phys. Rev. C* **73** 054309

[15] Jia C-S, Guo P and Peng X-L 2006 *J. Phys. A* **39** 7737

[16] de Castro A S 2007 *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **22** 2609

[17] Castro L B, de Castro A S and Hott M 2007 *Int. J. Mod. Phys. E* **16** 3002

[18] Jia C-S, Guo P, Diao Y-F, Yi L-Z and Xie X-J 2007 *Eur. Phys. J. A* **34** 41

[19] Castro L B, de Castro A S and Hott M B 2007 *EPL* **77** 20009

[20] Qiang W-C, Zhou R-S and Gao Y 2007 *J. Phys. A* **40** 1677

[21] Bayrak O and Boztosun I 2007 *J. Phys. A* **40** 11119

[22] Soylu A, Bayrak O and Boztosun I 2007 *J. Math. Phys.* **48** 082302

[23] Soylu A, Bayrak O and Boztosun I 2008 *J. Phys. A* **41** 065308

[24] Zhang L-H, Li X-P and Jia C-S 2008 *Phys. Lett. A* **372** 2201

[25] Zhang F-L, Fu B and Chen J-L 2008 *Phys. Rev. A* **78** 040101(R)

[26] Akcay H 2009 *Phys. Lett. A* **373** 616

[27] Arda A, Sever R and Tezcan C 2009 *Ann. Phys. (Berlin)* **18** 736

[28] S.M. Ikhdair 2010 *J. Math. Phys.* **51** 023525

[29] Aydogdu O and Sever R 2010 *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **325** 373

[30] Zarrinkamar S, Rajabi A A and Hassanabadi H 2010 *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **325** 2522

[31] Oyewumi K J and Akoshile C O 2010 *Eur. Phys. J. A* **45** 311

[32] Hamzavi M, Rajabi A A and Hassanabadi H 2010 *Phys. Lett. A* **374** 4303

[33] Hamzavi M, Rajabi A A and Hassanabadi H 2010 *Few-Body Syst.* **48** 171

[34] Ikhdair S M and Sever R 2010 *Appl. Math. Comput.* **216** 545

[35] Ikhdair S M and Server R 2010 *Appl. Math. Comput.* **216** 911

[36] Aydogdu O and Sever R 2011 *Phys. Lett. B* **703** 379

[37] Candemir N 2012 *Int. J. Mod. Phys. E* **21** 1250060

[38] Zhang M-C and Huang-Fu G-Q 2012 *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **327** 841

[39] Castro L B 2012 *Phys. Rev. C* **86** 052201(R)

[40] Hamzavi M and Ikhdair S M 2012 *Can. J. Phys.* **90** 655

[41] Agboola D 2012 *J. Math. Phys.* **53** 052302

[42] Hamzavi M, Eshghi M and Ikhdair S M 2012 *J. Math. Phys.* **53** 082101

[43] Ikhdair S M and Hamzavi M 2012 *Few-Body Syst.* **53** 487

[44] Guo J-Y 2012 *Phys. Rev. C* **85** 021302

[45] Chen S-W 2012 *Phys. Rev. C* **85** 054312

[46] Hamzavi M, Ikhdair S M and Ita B I 2012 *Phys. Scr.* **85** 045009

[47] Ikhdair S M and Server R 2012 *Appl. Math. Comput.* **218** 10082

[48] Akcay H and Server R 2013 *Few-Body Syst.* **54** 1839

[49] Thylwe K-E and Hamzavi M 2013 *Phys. Scr.* **87** 025004

[50] Ikhdair S M amd Falaye B J 2013 *Phys. Scr.* **87** 035002

[51] Liang H, Shen S, Zhao P and Meng J 2013 *Phys. Rev. C* **87** 014334

[52] Hamzavi M and Rajabi A A 2013 *Eur. Phys. J. Plus* **128** 20

[53] Hamzavi M and Rajabi A A 2013 *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **334** 316

[54] Castilho W M and de Castro A S 2014 *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **340** 1